

App. No. 10/826,898
Office Action Dated November 9, 2005

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Claims 1 and 6 are hereby amended. Claim 7 is new.

Applicants appreciate the courtesy extended by Examiners Bumsuk Won and Joseph Williams to Applicants' representatives, Douglas P. Mueller and Margaret F. Emerson, during the telephonic interview on February 7, 2006. During the interview, claim 1 and Miura (US 2001/0004187) were discussed. Formal agreement regarding the allowability of the claims was not reached, although it was agreed that revised claim 1 appeared to distinguish over Miura. The discussions of the interview are reflected in the comments that follow.

Applicants note that the Office Action Summary listed claims 1-16 as being rejected. Since the current application included only claims 1-6 at the time of examination, the listing is assumed to be a typographical error.

The feature of claims 1, 6, and 7, reciting "a system for supplying ...", is supported by Figure 5 and page 6, lines 31-33. New claim 7 further is supported by the subject matter of claim 1 and page 6, lines 34-36.

Claims 1, 2, and 5 were rejected as being anticipated by Miura (US 2001/0004187). Applicants traverse this rejection. Miura does not disclose an electron gun including an electron beam passing aperture provided in at least one of a surface of the first focusing electrode facing the second focusing electrode and a surface of the second focusing electrode facing the first focusing electrode that is a single opening common to three electron beams, wherein the first and the second focusing electrodes are supplied with equal electric potentials, as required by claim 1.

In the electron gun of claim 1, the common electron beam passing aperture is positioned where an electrostatic lens is not formed. An electrostatic lens is formed between electrodes that are supplied with different electric potentials. The electron beam passing aperture is required by claim 1 to be provided either in the surface of the first focusing electrode facing the second focusing electrode or in a surface of the second focusing electrode facing the first focusing electrode. Since both the first and second focusing electrodes are provided with equal electric

App. No. 10/826,898
Office Action Dated November 9, 2005

potentials, the electron beam passing aperture is provided at a position where a lens is **not formed**.

Miura discloses that a main lens is formed between a fifth electrode (36, rejection equates to the claimed anode electrode) and a cup-shaped electrode (35b, rejection equates to the claimed second focusing electrode). Therefore, the fifth electrode (36) and the cup-shaped electrode (35b) are supplied with different electric potentials. See paragraph 6. Therefore, the oval opening (36b1, rejection equates to the claimed single opening of the electron beam passing aperture) is provided at a position where a lens is **formed**.

Miura fails to disclose what kind of electron beam passing aperture is formed in each of the facing surfaces of electrodes 35a and 35b (rejection equates to the claimed first and second focusing electrodes). Therefore, the device disclosed by Miura does not disclose a common electron beam passing aperture that is provided in either the surface of the first or second focusing electrodes, as required by claim 1.

Favorable reconsideration of claims 1, 2, and 5 is requested.

Regarding new claim 7, Miura does not disclose or suggest an electron gun including a single opening of an electron beam passing aperture common to three electron beams that is positioned between a position of a prefocus lens and a position of a main lens. Favorable consideration of claim 7 is requested.

Claims 3 and 6 were rejected as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Matsuo (US 2002/0153825). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 3 should be considered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends. Applicants are not conceding the correctness of the rejection as applied to claim 3. As previously noted regarding claim 1, Miura does not disclose or suggest the electron beam passing aperture required by claim 6. Matsuo does not remedy the deficiencies of Miura, as previously noted. Favorable reconsideration of claims 3 and 6 is requested.

App. No. 10/826,898
Office Action Dated November 9, 2005

Claim 4 was rejected as being unpatentable over Miura in view of Takekawa (US 2002/0079820). Applicants traverse this rejection. Claim 4 should be considered allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1, from which it depends. Takekawa does not remedy the deficiencies of Miura, as previously noted. Favorable reconsideration of claim 4 is requested.

In view of the above, favorable reconsideration in the form of a notice of allowance is requested. Any questions regarding this communication can be directed to the undersigned attorney, Douglas P. Mueller, Reg. No. 30,300, at (612)455-3804.

Dated: February 8, 2006



DPM:mfe

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Douglas P. Mueller", written over a horizontal line.

Douglas P. Mueller
Reg. No.: 30,300
Hahnre, Schumann, Mueller & Larson, P.C.
225 South Sixth Street
Suite 2650
Minneapolis, MN 55402
612.455.3800